DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 021 UD 022 155

TITLE Follow Through Resource Center: Community School 77. Final Evaluation Report, 1980-1981.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adoption (Ideas); *Community Schools; Elementary Education; Individualized Instruction; *Information Dissemination; Inservice Education; Institutes (Training Programs); Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; *Resource Centers; Student Motivation
IDENTIFIERS *New York City Board of Education; *Project Follow Through; University of Kansas

ABSTRACT

This is a final report on the Follow Through Resource Center at Community School 77 in the Bronx (New York). The Center was established in 1977 to disseminate information about the University of Kansas behavior analysis Follow Through model. The report discusses the program's activities during 1980-81, and includes an evaluation of the Center's success in dissemination of program information, demonstration of the program, and pre-service training as well as the impact of the training on new adoption sites. A participant evaluation form, behavior analysis implementation check list for adopting sites and the questionnaire used for inservice participants are appended. The center's activities include the following components: (1) individualized instruction; (2) positive motivation; (3) continuous assessment of student progress; and (4) parent participation in classroom instruction and educational planning. The results of the evaluation indicate that most of the components of the behavior analysis model were implemented at the two adoption sites surveyed and that eleven new adoptions were achieved. Likewise, information about the model was disseminated through a variety of channels and resulted in an expanded audience. It is suggested, however, that more follow-up training time is needed for pre-service training workshops. (JCD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215021

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Project Number: 5001-48-17712

FOLLOW THROUGH RESOURCE CENTER
COMMUNITY SCHOOL 77
1980-1981

Project
Director: Marjorie McAllister

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Prepared By The
ANCILLARY SERVICES EVALUATION UNIT
Sharon Walker, Manager
Lila Lasky, Ed.D., Consultant

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
RICHARD GUTTENBERG, ADMINISTRATOR

UD 022 155

A SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION
FOR THE
1980-1981 COMMUNITY SCHOOL 77 FOLLOW THROUGH RESOURCE CENTER

The Follow Through Resource Center located at Community School 77 in the Bronx was established in 1977 to disseminate information about the University of Kansas behavior analysis Follow Through model. The major goal of the behavior analysis model is to increase students' academic performance through positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior. The Resource Center is charged with disseminating information about the program as well as demonstrating the program, providing pre-service training, providing in-service training for teachers at two pre-identified adoption sites, insuring that teachers at adopting sites are implementing the core elements of the program, and identifying new sites as prospective adopters.

The C.S. 77 Follow Through Resource Center more than adequately fulfilled its obligation during 1980-1981. Highlights of the findings reported in the comprehensive evaluation are listed below.

*Resource Center staff conducted more than 21 meetings and awareness workshops attended by over 335 participants, and the staff mailed information about the program to 135 individuals.

*The Resource Center staff responded to 100 percent of the requests they received for pre-service workshops, holding 13 three day pre-service training sessions attended by 127 people.

*Participant ratings of awareness workshops and training sessions were overwhelmingly positive. However, there was a general consensus that more in-service training is needed.

*Although full implementation of the program has yet to be achieved, in most cases, teachers at the two targeted adopting sites have at least partially implemented three of the four components of the behavior analysis model.

*The 11 projected adoptions for 1981-1982 bring the total number of schools using the behavior analysis model to 31.

The recommendations reported in the comprehensive evaluation which follows focus on helping the Resource Center effectively service the many schools which have adopted the behavior analysis Follow Through model, and are summarized below.

*In an effort to provide staff members at adopting schools with more support, the trainer's time needs to be carefully organized so that teachers at adopting sites can be continually monitored. Alternatively, the identification of a turn-key trainer at each site served for two or more years would allow the Resource Center staff to focus their training effort on newer adoptions.

*Requesting that all trainees complete an evaluation of each training program will provide both the training team and the evaluators with more complete information about the effectiveness of their training program.

*A reassessment and modification of the behavior analysis model, with the assistance of trained personnel, will allow the Follow Through Resource Center team to more effectively meet the needs of the special education and day care center children who will be served in the coming year.

*Arranging for parents at adopting schools to visit the C.S.77 parent involvement room and meet with parents already familiar with the program should lead to increased parental involvement at adopting sites.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	SUMMARY	i
	LIST OF TABLES	iv
	INTRODUCTION	1
I.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	2
II	EVALUATION PLAN	4
III.	FINDINGS	6
	Dissemination	6
	Demonstration	7
	Pre-Service Training	7
	In-Service Training	9
	Impact of Training	10
	New Adoptions	11
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	13
V.	APPENDICES	16
	Participant Evaluation Form	17
	Program Implementation Checklist	19
	Questionaire Used for In-Service Participants	20

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 - Evaluation Objectives and Assessment Procedures	4
Table 2 - Participants' Ratings of Awareness Workshops	8

INTRODUCTION

The Follow Through Program at Community School 77 (C.S. 77) in the Bronx is part of a federally funded, nation-wide project designed to extend the exemplary early education practices of Headstart and other preschool programs into the early elementary school grades. Follow Through models, based on the designs of different sponsoring institutions, were replicated at sites throughout the country in the late 1960's. Based on the evaluation of pupil achievement at these sites, the United States Office of Education validated 21 programs as successful and worthy of replication. One of the two validated programs in New York City is at Community School 77 in the Bronx.

Subsequent to validation, the Follow Through staff applied for and received an Office of Education grant to establish a resource center to disseminate its program. The Resource Center was initially funded for the year 1977-1978; subsequent awards were made for the next three years.

This report focuses on the Center's activities during 1980-81, its fourth year of operation, and includes an evaluation of the following Resource Center activities: dissemination of program information, demonstration of the program, pre-service training, impact of the training, and new adoptions.

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Community School 77 Follow Through Resource Center is housed with Follow Through classrooms in an annex to an older elementary school in the South Bronx. The Center's arrangement and activities reflect the philosophy of the Follow Through model designed by its sponsoring institution, the University of Kansas.

A major goal of the University of Kansas Follow Through model is to increase students' academic performance through positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior. The core elements of the model are:

--individualized instruction,

--positive motivation,

--continous assesment of pupil progress, and

--parent participation in classroom instruction and educational planning.

These strategies are applied to the teaching of reading, math, and language arts in the C.S.77 Follow Through Program.

Classrooms are arranged so that three distinct groups can function simultaneously, and teams of teachers, paraprofessionals, and trained parent assistants provide instruction to individuals as well as small groups. Most of the instruction is individualized, and the adult supervising each work group shows the children how much work they are to complete, corrects finished work, answers questions, and provides instruction when children are having difficulties.

Time is divided into "earn" periods, during which children earn tokens by behaving appropriately, and "spend" periods, during which children exchange their tokens in order to participate in activities of their choice.

Children whose behavior is disruptive to others are separated from the group for a short "time out," and are thus excluded from the opportunity to earn or spend tokens. The token system is generally used in kindergarten and first grade, while a point-sheet is substituted in the second grade, and a contract procedure is used in the third grade.

The New York City Board of Education, through the Early Childhood Unit within the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, administers the Follow Through Program, and the Resource Center activities are administered directly by a project management team, which consists of the Resource Center manager, a teacher trainer, a parent trainer, demonstration teachers, and a consultant from the University of Kansas. Part-time health and social services consultants are also members of the Resource Center staff. This year, a part-time public relations consultant was engaged to provide outreach assistance to the program. Because of cuts in federal funding, the auxiliary trainer, who was formerly part of the team, was not re-appointed. The Resource Center is supervised by the school's Follow Through coordinator and the principal of C.S. 77.

Two rooms in the annex of C.S.77 are the hub of the Resource Center activities. The dissemination unit, known as the Resource Center room, serves as the office and exhibit area. Charts and graphs of pupil progress are displayed here, along with logs, scrap books, and samples of instructional materials. Meetings and workshops are held in the Resource Center room and in the nearby parent room. The classrooms of the kindergarten through third-grade Follow Through teachers, who are certified as demonstration teachers, are also utilized in the training of adopting-site staff and parents.

II. EVALUATION PLAN

Six evaluation objectives were specified to assess the Resource Center's activities in 1980-1981, and an assessment procedure for evaluating each objective was determined. The evaluation objectives and assessment procedures are outlined in Table 1. Samples of the implementation checklists, participant evaluation forms, and interview schedule are presented in the Appendices.

TABLE 1

Evaluation Objectives and Assessment Procedures

ACTIVITY	OBJECTIVES	METHOD OF ASSESSMENT
A. Dissemination	-To determine whether information about the program was distributed at least twice locally and nationally.	-Examination of Resource Center records and logs. -Staff interviews.
B. Demonstration	-To determine whether Resource Center staff presented 3-5 awareness workshops. -To evaluate participant responses to these workshops.	-Examination of monthly calendars and workshop agendas. -Analysis of a random sample of participant evaluation forms.
C. Pre-Service Training	-To determine whether Resource Center staff responded to 75 percent of the requests for pre-service workshops. -To evaluate participant responses to these workshops.	-Examination of records and workshop agendas. -Analysis of completed evaluation forms.
D. In-Service Training	-To determine whether in-service training was provided 5-10 times at each of two adoption sites.	-Classroom observations. -Interviews with participants.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Evaluation Objectives and Assessment Procedures

ACTIVITY	OBJECTIVES	METHOD OF ASSESSMENT
	-To evaluate participant responses to the in-service training.	-Analysis of completed evaluation forms.
E. Impact of Training	-To determine whether the core elements of the program are being implemented at the targeted adopting sites.	-Review of implementation checklists completed during classroom observations. -Interviews with participants.
F. New Adoptions	-To determine whether at least two new sites have been identified as prospective adopters of the model.	-Examination of Resource Center final report. -Interviews with Resource Center staff.

III. FINDINGS

Dissemination

The Resource Center far exceeded its obligation to disseminate information about the program at least twice locally and nationally. In 1980-1981, the Resource Center mailed information about the program to 135 schools, 35 outside of New York City and 100 within the city. Staff members felt it best to concentrate their dissemination efforts on schools within New York that service populations similar to C.S. 77, and information about the program was sent to teachers outside of New York City only on request. Telephone contacts were not regularly logged.

The Resource Center also provided information about the program to over 200 people who attended the one on-site workshop and the 15 meetings and workshops held off-site. As well, the Resource Center staff advertised the program in several periodicals; however, only one of the five advertisements appeared to generate requests for information. The Center planned to develop radio spots, but these were not completed because final approval to hire a the public relations consultant came late in the year.

In their effort to provide useful information about the program, the Resource Center staff also revised and developed a number of publications. An awareness brochure, which had previously been xeroxed, was revised and printed commercially. In addition, two parent training manuals were developed for use in parent training workshops.

Another important element in the Resource Center's dissemination activities is the Resource Center itself. It contains literature on the behavior analysis model as well as samples of staff-developed and commercially published curriculum materials. Samples of daily schedules and back-up activities are also available for visitors to examine.

Demonstration

While the Resource Center staff was obligated to present three to five awareness workshops during the year, in fact, they exceeded this goal, and demonstrated the program to 135 participants. Those who attended the workshops were asked to complete a Participant Evaluation Form (see Appendix 1) in order to provide both the Center's staff and program evaluators with feedback about the effectiveness of the workshops.

Evaluators analyzed the responses of 45 workshop participants, and this sample included teachers, parents, aides, day care directors, administrators and paraprofessionals. Table 2 summarizes the participant's ratings of the awareness workshops, and indicates that 88 percent of the participants sampled gave the workshops very high ratings. However, many participants suggested that more time be spent answering questions, and requested additional time for classroom visits at C.S. 77.

Pre-Service Training

While the Resource Center staff was committed to respond to 75 percent of the requests they received for pre-service workshops, in fact, they honored 100 percent of these requests. Thirteen

TABLE 2

Participants' Ratings of Awareness Workshops (N=45)

Rating Scale	Usefulness of Content	Clarity of Presentation
5 (High)	14	17
4	24	27
3	0	0
2	7	1
1 (Low)	0	0

three-day pre-service training sessions were held. Thirty teachers and 18 supervisors attended the seven teachers' workshops, and 79 parents participated in the six training sessions for parents.

Of the 43 teachers and supervisors asked to evaluate the pre-service training, 21 responded.* Fourteen found the training very helpful, four considered it helpful, and three expressed no opinion. Comments appended to the evaluation forms were generally laudatory and indicated positive feelings about the trainer, the materials, and the behavior analysis model, although several participants expressed the need for longer workshops. Parents were not asked to evaluate the pre-service training program.

*The teacher trainer felt this low response rate might be due to the length of the evaluation form. A revised, one-page evaluation form was successfully field tested in June.

In-Service Training

The Resource Center staff was committed to provide five to ten in-service training sessions at each of two pre-identified adoption sites. A public elementary school in Queens and a publicly funded inner-city day care center in the Bronx were selected for evaluation because both programs not only reflected the broad spectrum of Follow Through adoption sites, but were also in the second year of adoption. According to training log entries, five training sessions were conducted at the day care center, and seven were conducted at the elementary school between September and December of 1980.

The evaluator observed six classes in the elementary school (K-2) and two classes in the day care center, and interviewed each of the teachers of these classes twice.

All teachers at both sites found the quality of training excellent and the personal qualities of the trainer outstanding. However, all felt that more in-service training was needed, particularly because several of the targeted teachers were involved in the program for the first time. In addition, eight of the ten teachers interviewed felt they needed more time to observe at the C.S. 77 demonstration classroom, and four expressed the desire for more on-site coordination of training by a liaison person.

Indications of preference for individualized and group training were evenly split, as was the teachers' assessment of the usefulness of the different components of the in-service program.

Administrators at the target elementary school were interviewed, and they clearly shared the teachers' generally positive feeling regarding the quality of the training. They were also equally aware of the need for additional training time, but were concerned about the source of funds for providing substitute teachers while the regular staff numbers attended training sessions.

Impact of Training

The evaluator collected information about the implementation of the core elements of the program at the two selected adoption sites through classroom observations and teacher interviews. Analysis of observation checklists and interview responses indicate that at least three of the core elements--individualized instruction, positive motivation, and continuous assessment of pupil progress--had been or were being implemented in the eight classrooms surveyed.

Teachers at the adoption elementary school noted that many of the children, especially those who had been low achievers, were more motivated, and they appreciated the assistance of adults in the classroom and liked the flexibility of the program materials. Teachers also noted significant changes in the children's behavior, and their ability to work independently. However, some teachers remarked that behavior problems still exist and that "time out" did not always work. Others found that individualization was difficult to accomplish alone, and expressed the need for more paraprofessional assistance.

The day care center teachers interviewed also commented on the children's increased motivation, although they had more difficulty implementing the program than their elementary school colleaques did. While they felt that the program worked well for some children, they had difficulty adapting the program to the needs of the younger children.

Several of the day care teachers suggested that if more materials were made available to them, they could perhaps implement the elements of the program more extensively. The director of the day care center also noted the need for more materials, and she suggested that teachers make their own. On the whole, the director felt the program was most effective with the older children at the day care center.

Parent involvement at both sites appeared rather limited. Parents at the elementary school had received training at the school early in the year, and as the year progressed, interest began to wane. With the exception of the kindergarten classroom, parental assistance was not evident. At the day care center, since most of the children's parents work full-time, the aides and volunteers were considered to be substitute participants, and although they had not received special training, they met regularly with the director of the day care center to discuss the program.

New Adoptions

The Resource Center was obligated to identify at least two new sites as prospective adopters of the model. In fact, the Resource

Center's final report lists eleven new adoptions for the 1980-1981 year, including four public elementary schools, three private elementary schools, and four day care centers, all located in New York City. A total of 31 classes will be served. Several of the potential adopters of the behavior analysis model serve special-education children; this is most likely in response to the National Diffusion Network's sanctioning of this center's solicitation of special education programs as possible adopters of the behavior analysis model. As well, several of the potential adopters are Bronx day care centers which feed into public elementary schools which have already adopted the model. However, implementation of the behavior analysis model at these sites is being delayed until the United States Office of Education issues guidelines for pre-school adoptions of Follow Through models.

The C.S.77 Follow Through coordinator and the city-wide coordinator expressed satisfaction with the number of new adoptions, and they hope to expand the program to schools in New Jersey and Pennsylvania next year.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The C.S. 77 Resource Center more than adequately fulfilled its obligation to disseminate information about the program, provide training, and solicit new adoptions during the 1980-1981 funding year. Morever, the data clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of the staff's activities. Information about the behavior analysis Follow Through model was disseminated through a variety of channels and resulted in an expanded audience. The addition of a paid consultant facilitated the revision of printed materials, the creation of a new slide program, and additional parent training materials.

Analysis of participant ratings of awareness and pre-service training workshops were consistently positive; more than 75 percent of the teacher trainees at adoption sites responded favorably to the training workshops. However, there is a general consensus that more follow-up training time is needed.

The data also reveal that most of the core elements of the behavior analysis model have been implemented at the two adoption sites surveyed. The evaluators also found that the day care center teachers who were involved in the program were warmly accepting of its components, despite their awareness of the unique needs of the younger children they serve.

The Center's success in achieving new adoptions is noteworthy. The earnestness and professionalism of the Resource Center staff resulted in eleven new adoptions, nine more than projected at

the onset of the program year. Although the program is generally costly to implement, the staff's willingness to allow adopters to modify the program enabled them to achieve more widespread acceptance of the program in the New York City area.

The cooperation of the principal, community school board, parent advisory council, and the city-wide Follow Through coordinator has served to stimulate interest in this Follow Through model. As well, their support and assistance enabled paperwork to move through the necessary channels swiftly. The Center team managed to organize each facet of its responsibilities successfully.

In light of the successful implementation of proposed objectives, it is strongly recommended that the Community School 77 Follow Through Resource Center be continued.

Recommendations

Teachers at the two adopting sites evaluated expressed a strong need for more in-service training, and the Resource Center staff may want to consider a careful organization of the trainer's time so that teachers at adopting sites can be continually monitored. Alternatively, it might be beneficial to train an on-site "turn-key" trainer at each adopting site served for two or more years to support the participants' efforts at implementation. However, before this suggestion can be implemented, it would be important to write a clear job description for this new position.

In order to provide the training team with a more complete evaluation of their training programs, we suggest that all trainees be asked to complete an assessment questionnaire at the conclusion of the training program, and that a more determined effort be made to collect these program evaluations.

As well, it is recommended that members of the Follow Through team conduct a careful assessment of the model with the assistance of trained personnel who will be able to help the team modify components of the program. Perhaps consultants from the University of Kansas could assist in this undertaking. Such modifications should be aimed at the needs of individual pupils particularly in special education settings.

In order to increase the effectiveness of parent participation, we recommend that the team arrange for parents at adopting sites to visit the C.S. 77 Resource Center, where they can interact with parents already experienced in the program.

The practice of preparing a monthly calendar of events has been useful in the past and we suggest that it be continued. We would also recommended that a log of telepone contacts be kept next year. The cost effectiveness of advertisements should also be carefully monitored.

In the event that the Resource Center is funded next year, it is recommended that the Center manager become more involved in the training provided at adoption sites; the increased number of adoptions will certainly necessitate such action.

In light of the projected federal budget cuts, it is recommended that the Center team look to the strengths of existing staff members in order to close the gap which personnel cuts may create. Efficiency and cooperation have characterized the Resource Center staff's operations in the past, and are a testament to good human relations practices. It is strongly urged that they be continued.

APPENDIX

Behavior Analysis Follow Through Program
Ruth Khelseau, Project Coordinator

Community School 77
Leon Taylor, Principal

BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS FOLLOW THROUGH RESOURCE CENTER

Participant Evaluation Form

1. How did you find out about the Community School 77 B.A. Resource Center?

   Publication, Meida ( )
   National Diffusion Network ( )
   Educational Programs That Work ( )
   Newsletters, announcements ( )
   Other ( ) - please indicate_____

2. Was the information presented or content useful to you?

Not at All	Somewhat	No Opinion	Yes	Absolutely
( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

3. Were the presentations clear and easily understood?

Not at All	Somewhat	No Opinion	Yes	Absolutely
( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

4. What activities did you find most informative and helpful with regard to describing the Follow Through Program & Resource Center?

   (example: slide presentation, data presentation, staff development, parent involvement panel)

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. Do you wish further contact with the Resource Center Staff for additional informati and/or possible adoption of program components?

   Yes No Undecided

Name_____

Address_____

Affiliation_____

6. Check the appropriate box that indicates position held.

School Administrator ( )

School Board Member ( )

Teacher ( )

Parent ( )

Other - ( ) - please indicate _____

Leon Taylor, Principal
Ruth Khelseau, Coordinator

Louise Cooper, Manager
Judith Scher BenHaim Staff Trainer
Thomasenia Key, Auxiliary Trainer
Elva Fulton, Parent Coordinator

Adopting Site Behavior Analysis Implementation Checklist

School Year _____
School: _____ District: _____
Address: _____ Principal: _____
Number of Classrooms Participating: _____

Key: √: Implemented N: Not Implemented
S: Sometimes Implemented NA: Not Applicable

	Class A	B	C	D	E	F
Instruction in small groups and/or individualized						
Daily plan on board						
Menus posted						
Back-ups vary						
Tokens, point sheets or contracts in use						
Frequent teacher contacts						
Frequent pupil response						
Use of descriptive praise						
Absence of negative comments						
Use of behavior contingencies						
Daily spend periods						
Curricula materials used appropriately						
Pupil Progress monitoring						
Parents assist in instruction						

QUESTIONNNAIRE USED FOR IN-SERVICE PARTICIPANTS

1. Would you please describe the type(s) of training you received?
2. Which type did you find most useful?
3. Was this training adequate?
4. If you could have additional training, which type would you like to have?
5. How you would evaluate the trainer's approach to her work?
6. About which of the core elements did you receive the most helpful training?
7. Which element of the B.A. model do you like best?
8. Which element(s) were you able to implement?
9. Which element(s) do the pupils appear to like best?
10. Have you noticed any changes in your pupils since your implementation, or differences from previous groups?
11. What had been the extent of parent participation?